

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar and U.S. form. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein and replaced by new claims 15-28.

Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Honda (JP 05103395 A). Further, dependent claims 5-7 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Saiki et al. (US 6,208,237). These rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of original claims 1-14. Further, these rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to new claims 15-28 for the following reasons.

New Claims 15-28 are Patentable Over the Honda Reference

New independent claim 15 recites a suspension device for spanning between an inner member and an outer member, the suspension device including, in part, (1) a plurality of roll sections configured to span between the inner member and outer member and being arranged in a loop, (2) a plurality of boundary sections each of the boundary sections arranged between an adjacent pair of roll sections, such that said roll sections and said boundary sections are arranged so as to form a continuously alternating pattern of the roll sections and the boundary sections, (3) wherein the continuously alternating pattern of the roll sections and the boundary sections forms a continuous closed loop having a continuous surface, (4) wherein the each of the roll sections includes an inner-connecting edge configured to connect to the inner member and an outer-connecting edge configured to connect to the outer member, and (5) wherein each of the roll sections constitutes a semi-cylindrical curved surface spanning from the inner-connecting edge to the outer-connecting edge. Honda fails to disclose or suggest the continuously alternating pattern of the roll sections and the boundary sections which forms a continuous closed loop having a continuous surface.

In contrast to the invention of claim 15, Honda teaches a damper for a loud speaker, wherein mobile sections 12 are circumferentially arranged around a voice coil 16 (see fig. 2). Moreover, Honda teaches that the mobile sections 12 are spaced apart so as to allow the direction of roll (i.e., curve) to alternate (i.e., first mobile section curves upwardly, adjacent mobile section curves downwardly, etc.). Specifically, the spacing apart of the mobile sections 12 is constituted by each mobile section 12 only connecting to an inner member 16 and an outer member 11 (e.g., forming a non-continuous surface between the inner member 16 and the outer member 11). Accordingly, each mobile section 12 of Honda is arranged in a non-continuous manner allowing independent movement of each mobile section 12. Thus, the following differences between the present invention as recited in claim 15 and the Honda reference become evident.

Honda teaches non-continuous and independent mobile sections being arranged around a voice coil, wherein each mobile section is only connected to the inner member and the outer member. However, Honda does not disclose or suggest a plurality of roll sections and a plurality of boundary sections wherein each boundary section is arranged between an adjacent pair of roll sections so as to form a continuously alternating pattern of the roll sections and the boundary sections which forms a continuous closed loop having a continuous surface. Specifically, Honda does not teach the distinguishing features recited in claim 15 because an arrangement of mobile sections such that each mobile section is non-continuous and independent with relation to the other mobile sections, does not disclose or suggest a plurality of roll sections and boundary sections forming a continuous closed loop having a continuous surface.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Honda reference does not anticipate the invention as recited in new independent claim 15 or the claims that depend therefrom. Furthermore, Honda does not suggest the above-discussed limitations of claims 15-28. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Honda reference so as to obtain the invention of claims 15-28. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15-28 are allowable over Honda.

New Claims 15-28 are Patentable Over Honda in View of Saiki

The Examiner rejected original dependent claims 5-6 and 12-13 as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Saiki. The Examiner relied on Saiki for teaching the use of two suspensions and the use of an odd number of roll sections. However, although Saiki does in fact


disclose two suspensions and the use of an odd number of roll sections, Saiki does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 15 which are lacking from Honda.

Accordingly, the combination of Honda in view of Saiki fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 15. Thus, it is apparent that claim 15 and the claims that depend therefrom are allowable over Honda in view of Saiki.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuki HONDA et al.

By: 
Charles R. Watts
Registration No. 33,142
Attorney for Applicants

ALD(CRW)/mjw
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 15, 2007